



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/694,779	10/24/2000	Gerrit Bleumer	2455-4581US1	8575

7590 09/22/2004

MORGAN & FINNEGAN, L.L.P.  
345 Park Avenue  
New York, NY 10154

EXAMINER

CALLAHAN, PAUL E

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2137	

DATE MAILED: 09/22/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/694,779	BLEUMER, GERRIT
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Paul Callahan	2137

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 24 October 2000.  
 2a) This action is FINAL.                            2b) This action is non-final.  
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-13 is/are pending in the application.  
 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.  
 5) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.  
 6) Claim(s) 1-13 is/are rejected.  
 7) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.  
 8) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.  
 10) The drawing(s) filed on 24 October 2000 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.  
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).  
 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  
 a) All    b) Some \* c) None of:  
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.  
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.  
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  
 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)  
 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)  
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date 3.

4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_\_.  
 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)  
 6) Other: \_\_\_\_\_.

## DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1-13 are pending in this and have been examined.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

2. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

3. Claims 1-13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Independent claims 1, 10, and 12 each contain the phrase; "...a seed key substantially known only to the issuer of the ticket." It is unclear what the applicant considers "substantially known" to mean, i.e., what degree of knowledge of the key the issuer is to have. The term "substantially known" in claims 1, 10, and 12 is a relative term that renders the claim indefinite. The term is not defined by the claim, the specification does not provide a standard for ascertaining the requisite degree, and one of ordinary skill in the art would not be reasonably apprised of the scope of the invention. Claims 2-9, 11, and 13 are dependent on claims 1, 10, and 13 respectively and are rejected on the same basis.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

4. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

5. Claims 1, 8, 10 and 12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being clearly anticipated by Chaum, US 4,947,430.

As for claim 1, Chaum teaches a multiple use ticket method (col. 6 lines 50-55), comprising providing a blind signature in a ticket, the signature having a multiple use (col. 6 lines 50-55), and developing a blinding value for the signature in a reproducible computation (col. 4 lines 20-67) using a seed key substantially known only to the issuer of the ticket (col. 6 lines 1-15).

As for claims 10 and 12, these claims represent the system and instruction set embodied in a computer readable memory that carry out the method of claim 1 and are thereby rejected on the same basis as that claim.

As for claim 8, Chaum teaches a signature method that is not an interactive protocol (col. 4 lines 20-67).

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

6. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

7. Claims 3-7 and 9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chaum as applied to claims 1, 10, and 12 supra, and Official Notice.

Chaum does not explicitly teach a multiple use ticket that is; a personal ticket as in claim 3, an electronic season ticket as in claim 4, an untraceable personal ticket as in claim 5, a personal license as in claim 6, a personal driver's license as in claim 7, or an off-line personal ticket as in claim 9. Official Notice May be taken however, that the use of a blind multi-use signature on tickets (messages) that are personal tickets, electronic season tickets, untraceable personal tickets, personal licenses, or personal driver's licenses are steps that are old and well known in the art of electronic credentials. Motive to incorporate these features into the system of Chaum are found in col. 6 lines 49-55 where he does teach that the particular type of ticket (message) is contemplated in his invention to include any type of ticket (message) on which a blind multi-use signature can be incorporated. Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate these features into the system of Chaum. It would be desirable to do so as this would serve to increase the utility of the system.

***Allowable Subject Matter***

8. Claims 2, 11, and 13 would be allowable if rewritten to overcome the rejection(s) under 35 U.S.C. 112, 2nd paragraph, set forth in this Office action and to include all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

9. The following is a statement of reasons for the indication of allowable subject matter: The feature of a built-in time expiration for a signature used in the manner of the applicant is not found in the prior art.

***Conclusion***

10. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Paul E. Callahan whose telephone number is (703) 305-1336. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F from 9 to 5.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Greg Morse, can be reached on (703) 308-4789. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is: (703) 872-9306. Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-3900.

8/6/04

*Paul Callahan*